

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND PURCHASING
(Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council)

Chairman: Mr. Robert O. Call, Jr., Council District No. 3

A **meeting** of the **COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND PURCHASING**, Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council, was held on **Monday, August 9, 2010**, in the Assembly Room of the Berkeley County Administration Building, 1003 Highway 52, Moncks Corner, South Carolina, at 6:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Robert O. Call, Jr., Council District No. 3; Committee Member Phillip Farley, Council District No. 1; Committee Member Timothy J. Callanan, Council District No. 2; Committee Member Cathy S. Davis, Council District No. 4; Committee Member Dennis L. Fish, Council District No. 5; Committee Member Jack H. Schurlknight, Council District No. 6; Committee Member Caldwell Pinckney, Jr., Council District No. 7; County Supervisor Daniel W. Davis; Ms. Nicole Ewing, County Attorney; and Ms. Barbara B. Austin, Clerk of County Council. Committee Member Steve C. Davis, Council District No. 8 was absent.

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, the electronic and print media were duly notified.

Chairman Call: "I'd like to call the Committee on Public Works and Purchasing to order. First item on the agenda is the approval of minutes from July 12, 2010 and July 26, 2010."

Committee Member Pinckney: "Move for approval"

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Second"

Chairman Call: "I have a motion and a second. Any discussions or additions or comments on the minutes? (No Response) I will call for the vote. All in favor say Aye? (Ayes) All opposed Nay? (No Response) The Ayes have it."

It was moved by Committee Member Pinckney and seconded by Committee Member Schurlknight to **approve** the minutes as presented. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

A. Consideration of a **Resolution** setting fees for a Stormwater Service Fee to fund implementation of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Mr. Frank Carson, Berkeley County Engineer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have provided in the packet a staff summary outlining what we are asking for tonight. In ordinance 07-07-44, which established the regulations to enforce the Stormwater Management Program as required by our DHEC and NPDES Phase 2 permits allow for charges and fees for a Stormwater Service Fee. In last years' budget, we budgeted for those fees, however, we did not collect those fees because the revision and the establishment of the rates was to be done by County Council.

That is what we are here to do tonight. We've also provided a letter report from our consulting...Stormwater consultants, Woolpert, Inc, that discusses the purpose of those fees and the reasons for the fees and also provides information on other jurisdictions in the area and what their fees are. The first thing I wanted to point out is Berkeley County would be the last entity in the area to have such fees. The other point being since we are regulated MS4, we now perform work that DHEC has done in the past and charged fees as well as pointed out in the letter report. The rates we are recommending essentially apply to any reviews that we are required to do for Stormwater Management for the erosion and sediment control and for the inspections. These are comparable to other entities in the area and comparable to what DHEC is also charging. I'm sure there are questions."

Chairman Call: "Mr. Carson, is this mandated?"

Mr. Carson: "These reviews, as I said, these are reviews under the Erosion and Sediment Control General Permit of the state but because with the Phase II Regulations, those were passed on to local entities who have urbanized area. If you recall, our MS4 area, which is the urbanized area according to the census. In this case, the 2000 census coincides generally with our Service Zone 1 for the impact fees and since that was already set up in a lot of the administrative systems for the county, we chose to use that boundary. In those areas, whereas before those applications and the review would go straight to DHEC, they now come through the County and we are required to do those reviews."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Mr. Chairman?"

Chairman Call: "Mr. Schurlknight"

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Frank, where does agriculture fit into all of this? I think there was an exemption through the state?"

Mr. Carson: "Yes sir. This isn't a Stormwater Fee. This is only for development. So if you submit for a building permit or a subdivision plan, that's where these come into play. This is to review those plans and do the required inspections."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Ok, this is for planned developments that we are talking about here?"

Mr. Carson: "Yes"

Chairman Call: "Mr. Carson, how much of an extra burden does this put on the people that have to work under this system? Contractors, I presume, is who it will affect the most. Is that correct?"

Mr. Carson: "Well, again, this would be for any of those developments. They are paying these fees now in other jurisdictions, so if you were going to build a subdivision in Mt. Pleasant, you are paying those fees in Mt. Pleasant. You are also paying fees previously in Berkeley

County to OCRM to do the same thing. So whereas, in the past, you would have an application fees to OCRM and you would also have the Plan Review and Inspection Fees. Now, the County is doing that and the only thing that we pass along is called a Notice of Intent, which goes to OCRM and DHEC and we are not charging the Plan Review and Inspection Fees until this gets passed.”

Chairman Call: “Thank you. Any more questions for Mr. Carson?”

Committee Member Fish: “Mr. Chairman?”

Chairman Call: “Was that Mr. Fish? Ok, Mr. Fish”

Committee Member Fish: “Frank, tell of the other counties, this is talked about anybody who has a lot that builds their own individual residence on. This includes that as well, right? Some of the other counties are exempting single family residences less than an acre.”

Mr. Carson: “We didn’t distinguish between what the construction was. We did it by parcel size, which is what is in the regulation.”

Committee Member Fish: “I understand that but some of the counties, if it is a single, it’s an individual, not a developer, but an individual with less than an acre, they are exempting the fee. This applies to all building permits regardless of who the builder is, is that correct?”

Mr. Carson: “Yes. Let’s say in Georgetown County and Dorchester County, they have that exemption, yes.”

Committee Member Fish: “Would you consider that for us, why or why not?”

Mr. Carson: “We did consider and just felt like it’s more consistent just to charge the fee. It’s \$100 fee.”

Committee Member Fish: “What kind of input have you gotten from developers and other people who this impacts? Are they aware of it and what kind of impact or feedback have you gotten from them?”

Mr. Carson: “We didn’t publish it. Again, this was in the ordinance, the 07 ordinance, so the ability to do it always been there since 07 and it’s a fee that they are paying now to DHEC in those cases where that permit is required.”

Committee Member Fish: “I agree. I just find it strange that we do it in the quiet of the night. We just got this package on Thursday and it’s like we are kinda sneaking it through. I think in fairness to the people impacted have got to be aware of it. That is my take on it.”

Committee Member Callanan: “Mr. Chairman?”

Chairman Call: "Mr. Callanan"

Committee Member Callanan: "Frank, I too would just like more time just so the people who are most affected have enough time to digest it. I don't think...you know, we have been waiting a couple of years. I don't think another month is going to kill us, right?"

Mr. Carson: "That's right"

Committee Member Callanan: "Ok, the other question I had is looking at a comparison of our fees to Charleston County, it is a pretty substantial difference in price for ours versus Charleston County. I think to start off for a half acre it is \$100 for them, for us it is \$150 and then with the \$4,000 max for us with \$2,000 max for Charleston County. I just...I don't want these to be so excessively more than the other counties it becomes cost prohibitive. I just was kinda curious as the basis when you look at where our neighbors are and I can see Dorchester is a little bit higher."

Mr. Carson: "For one thing, Dorchester County's is new. If you look at Charleston County's, that is what has been effect since 1991. So they haven't changed that rate. We didn't call them. A lot of us use the same consultant and this was their advice based on their experience with those entities. We could call them and find out if they are contemplating changing those rates. I wouldn't be surprised if they are. They have been in effect for nine years, so I know their costs have gone up. But, we can look into that."

Committee Member Callanan: "If you could. I just would like to....if it's not...this is a resolution so it doesn't go through the process of three readings."

Committee Member Farley: "Yes, it does. This is an ordinance."

Mr. Carson: "No, this is just a resolution."

Committee Member Farley: "Oh, this is a resolution?"

Mr. Carson: "Yes sir"

Committee Member Callanan: "That is what I'm saying, if we could hold this. Let the builders see it, let the homeowners see it. Let them know what they are going to be subject too."

Mr. Carson: "Ok, if anybody gets any questions forward them to me and we will...."

Committee Member Farley: "This is for new construction correct?"

Mr. Carson: "Yes sir"

Committee Member Farley: "The regular homeowner will not see this on their tax bill like a lot of the other counties...."

Mr. Carson: "No sir. It is a fee that is paid when they submit the plans. In the case of the inspection fees, it is paid before they start construction."

Committee Member Farley: "Ok, because you and I talked about that in 07, the people that were being charged a Stormwater Fee and they wanted to know why they had to pay the \$25 a year for this. This will not affect the homeowner that already has a house unless he builds him one."

Mr. Carson: "That is correct."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Frank, is this for only residential?"

Mr. Carson: "No sir. It's any land disturbance in that zone. We also do plan review for other entities. We do plan review for development in some of the municipalities and this would also help set a fee for doing those reviews for them. If it is outside the regulated area, outside of Zone 1, maybe you are more familiar with, that is what it applies to. Now, when the new census comes into effect, that area is bound to grow and we are going to be dealing with a lot more regulation. We are coming up to the end of a new permit cycle and that permit is going to require more stringent obligations on the county and that is going to be another consideration when we get to that point."

Chairman Call: "Mr. Carson? I'm sorry, are you through?"

Committee Member Schurlknight: "The only comment that I was going to make was that I agree with Mr. Callanan. I'd like to see us hold this thing also, at least for a month to kinda digest and answer a few more questions."

Chairman Call: "Ok, we will honor Mr. Callanan's request on that, but I would like to ask you two questions to be thinking about in the meantime. Does this apply to a homeowner if they are putting an addition on their home? Are they going to have these plan review fees?"

Mr. Carson: "No sir"

Chairman Call: "I don't want to get a homeowners....contractors probably know about these things...homeowners usually don't know it until an inspector that got up on the wrong side of the bed goes out there and finds it. I don't want that if possible."

Mr. Carson: "Mr. Greenway assures me his inspectors always get on the right side of the bed."

Chairman Call: "They've got a round bed, Eric? Ok we will hold that...."

Supervisor Davis: "Mr. Chairman, I just want to mention something. Stormwater Regulations as most of Council knows, have been coming down for a good long while and this is

going to be one of those Federal requirements that is going to overwhelm us and we have little or nothing to say about it, but we are just going to have to do it. It's kinda like waste treatment. In some cases, some people fear that stormwater treatment may get to be just like sewage treatment. The inspection fee that Frank is talking about is a user fee and I think the next item on the agenda is a request for some money from contingency because we have not been charging any fees and so what we don't collect in fees is going to be spread out among all tax payers. I just want to point that out. It is a user fee. I think we want to be careful that we don't try to operate this stormwater program out of taxes. It needs to be a utility and fees charged for those that use it. It's not a lot of money right now but eventually we are going to be talking about larger sums of money for stormwater management."

Chairman Call: "My reason for that comment in my normal course of business I see these structures to prevent erosion. In Dorchester County I believe it was, I witnessed a situation where a dump truck backed over the erosion control curtain screen and as soon as he pulled out, there was an officer there to write the builder a ticket for the screen being down. It didn't seem quite fair and I hope we can get our inspectors to use some judgment. At least maybe give them some notice, maybe two notices before they write them a citation. You just can't stand there and watch every delivery truck that crosses that curb."

Mr. Carson: "If you go back and read the original ordinance it outlines the enforcement process and basically by the time you get to any charges, they've had ample opportunity. It starts with just a verbal notice. It goes to a written notice and then finally a ticket. There is a process that I think that is fair to the builder and the permittee as well."

Chairman Call: "I would point you as an example, if you would, I know ya'll don't work over there, but on Daniel Island there's several unique methods to keep erosion, sediment, water or anything else on site instead of letting it get into the curb and in the storm drainage system. You may want to take a look at some of those and be ready to consider some of them as an alternative to what most people are using now. We'll hold it, Mr. Callanan. A month long enough for you to do what you need to do to it?"

Committee Member Callanan: "Yea, I would think so."

Chairman Call: "Thank you Frank. Do you have another item on the agenda?"

B. Mr. Frank Carson, Berkeley County Engineer, Re: Transfer of additional funds in the amount of \$6,510.35 from contingency to the Stormwater Management Program department.

Mr. Carson: "Yes sir, the other item is for the request for additional funds for fiscal year 09 – 10 for \$6,510.35. As we just discussed, we had budgeted Plan Review Fees and Inspection Fees in our budget. Obviously, we didn't collect those and given the market in construction, probably would not have achieved what was budgeted in any case. We continue to have those costs that Supervisor Davis just mentioned."

Committee Member Pinckney: "Mr. Chairman?"

Chairman Call: "Mr. Caldwell Pinckney"

Committee Member Pinckney: "Mr. Carson, you mentioned we did not collect the fees. Was that due to the fact that we have not voted on Item A yet?"

Mr. Carson: "Yes sir."

Committee Member Fish: "Mr. Chairman?"

Chairman Call: "Mr. Fish"

Committee Member Fish: "Will this come out of the ...to balance the budget for 2010 out of contingency or does this reflect to 2011?"

Ms. Kace Smith, Finance Director: "It would be fiscal year 2010."

Committee Member Fish: "Thank you"

Committee Member Pinckney: "Mr. Chairman, one other question."

Chairman Call: "Mr. Pinckney"

Committee Member Pinckney: "I've got one other question for Mr. Carson. Also just then you stated that even so if we had collected it will still would have been insufficient. Did I understand you to say that, for what we need to do?"

Mr. Carson: "Well, we have our budget, the approved budget called for \$25,000 collected in Plan Review Fee. Given the amount of Plan Review we have had, I don't think that we would have collected \$25,000. Our expenses, most of the expenses are in Special Contracts and in the Consulting Services and also our Permit Fees. There is no, in the Stormwater Management Budget, there is no personnel costs. Those are very specific to the Stormwater Program. We separated it for that reason. These are costs that we are incurring because of compliance with the NPDES permits."

Committee Member Pinckney: "And the reason for that question was, you know, we are discussing prior to that we are discussing the fee schedule. I'm just sitting here wondering how the recommended fee schedule would address Item B had we collected the funds based on the recommended schedule. Has that been actually looked at or is that something you can look at and present to us next month? Does that make sense to you?"

Mr. Carson: "Yes sir. It would take quite a bit of work to go back and dig out all those projects to calculate what the fee would have been on projects that we reviewed a year ago."

Committee Member Pinckney: "I guess my reasoning for that, is that when we look at the recommended fee schedule to say whether or not we are going to vote it up or down. You know if we had some real rationale to say 'Well we had to go dah dah la dah based on our findings or whatever. I don't mean to create no more work for you, but....'"

Mr. Carson: "We'll give it a shot."

Committee Member Pinckney: "Thank you sir."

Chairman Call: "Any other questions for Mr. Carson?" (No Response) What is the Committee's pleasure?"

Committee Member Pinckney: "So move"

Chairman Call: "Do I have a second?"

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Second"

Chairman Call: "Motion and a second. Thank you. Any further discussion? (No Response) Hearing none, I'll call for the vote. All in favor say Aye? (Ayes) All opposed Nay? (No Response) The motion carries.

It was moved by Committee Member Pinckney and seconded by Committee Member Schurlknight to **approve** the transfer of additional funds in the amount of \$6,510.35 from contingency to the **Stormwater Management Program** department. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

C. Ms. Angela Pinson, Director of Administration, Berkeley County Water and Sanitation, Re: Purchase and installation of Cogsdale Utility Billing Software in the amount of \$656,593.00, initial amount of \$131,319.00; balance to be paid over a four year period in the approximate amount of \$172,938 per year.

Ms. Pinson: "Thank you Mr. Chairman. In June, Water & Sanitation accepted proposals for a new utility billing software. I'm here tonight requesting approval to award the contract to Cogsdale Utility Billing in the amount of...the total amount of \$656,593."

Committee Member Callanan: "Move for approval"

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Second"

Chairman Call: "Motion and a second. Any discussion?"

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Yea, I have one question Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Call: "Go ahead"

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Angela, on the system that we have now. How old is that system?"

Ms. Pinson: "About 26 years old."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "26 years old and I imagine some of the problems you find is support and keeping it up and going and efficiency."

Ms. Pinson: "Support and efficiency, yes sir."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "Ok, thank you."

Chairman Call: "I think I read their summary with it and it looks to me like it's basically held together with baling wire. About five different systems trying to work together. Some of them don't work. Some of them you can't get parts for. Some of them are not compatible. Is that basically what the problem is?"

Ms. Pinson: "It's a communication issue, yes sir."

Chairman Call: "Do I have a motion and a second? "

Committee Member Callanan: "Yes"

Chairman Call: "Any further discussion or questions? (No Response) Hearing none, I'll call for the vote. All in favor say Aye? (Ayes) All opposed Nay? (No Response) The Ayes have it."

It was moved by Committee Member Callanan and seconded by Committee Member Schurlknight to **approve** the purchase and installation of **Cogsdale Utility Billing Software** in the amount of \$656,593.00, initial amount of \$131,319.00; balance to be paid over a four year period in the approximate amount of \$172,938 per year. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

D. Mr. John F. Hamer, CPPB, Director of Procurement, Re: Purchase of motor grader budgeted in FY 2010-2011.

Mr. Hamer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Roads & Bridges got approved for another motorgrader just like we have just purchased. In our bid documents, it does allow by mutual agreement of the vendor and the County to add additional purchases and Blanchard was awarded the contract on that and they have agreed to honor their price for another purchase of the same motorgrader that we just purchased. It is our recommendation to go ahead and award that based on the bid package that was awarded back in March."

Chairman Call: "How much was that, John?"

Mr. Hamer: "The cost of the unit plus the extended warranty and the service agreement was \$203,952. It had a guaranteed buy back in five years of \$94,727."

Committee Member Callanan: "Mr. Chairman"

Chairman Call: "Yes, Mr. Callanan"

Committee Member Callanan: "My goal on this is trying to get more people involved in the bidding process. Obviously, I have failed, being we have two people here, but there is one thing that bothered about this and it bothers me about the last bids, is the...and it may have been this case, but I know it was a case where the dozer. The thing that Blanchard over the top last time was it's response time and I drove and they put a 30 minute response time and I've driven and timed it between the maintenance shed and Blanchard and it is 28 minutes. That's from their driveway to there and hitting one of three lights. They put a response time here that can't be met. Now obviously, there is a penalty there, but I just view this as gaming the bid system. Because well, we'll put the 30 minutes there but then sure, we will pay a penalty, but we will win the bid. It's not why we have guaranteed response time. I have a problem with putting a number in there that realistically cannot be met. My other problem naturally is I just think I've tried to work with the bid process to make it more competitive. Obviously, I have failed. I just can't support any bids from now on that don't have at least three people on there. That is just a personal policy."

Mr. Hamer: "Part of the guarantee when we had the prebid, we just set a penalty and we did say that we would allow at least 30 minutes before we would assess the penalty, so we kinda granted them a 30 minute grace period beyond what they stated. We did allow that to all bidders as part of the prebid that we had."

Committee Member Fish: "Mr. Chairman"

Chairman Call: "Mr. Fish"

Committee Member Fish: "What year is the trade that you are trading in on this?"

Mr. Hamer: "The trade in was optional on that bid so I will have to ask Danny what he is trading in. We have not got a price for the trade in."

Committee Member Fish: "They are showing \$67,000 with trade in. How old is that unit?"

Mr. Hamer: "That was on the one we did in March. You would have a different unit that we would trade in. We would negotiate that and have them give us a price but we always go out and check Gov.deals to make sure that the price is fair. We did some trade-ins last year. We sold some on Gov.deals. Whichever price we get that is best."

Committee Member Fish: "They are willing to give us \$67,000 for that unit that we are trading in. Is that correct?"

Mr. Hamer: "That was on the one we did in March. It would be a different unit on this one. We have not negotiated that price yet."

Committee Member Fish: "What I find strange is they'll give us \$67,000, but yet they will guarantee to buy it back for \$94,000. One of the things that disturbed me a little bit more, that bothers me, is that Blanchard, of course, is the one. Number One, I've got to ask the question. I'm going to get criticized for it. Can we guarantee we will get a 2010 model?"

Mr. Hamer: "Yes sir."

Committee Member Fish: "Number Two is that according to your notes here, that bid was awarded on March 22nd. That was prior to First Reading of our budget where the motion in the budget was denied that 29% local option tax for this equipment. It bothers me that ya'll went ahead and put the bid out before the budget was there with the caveat that we wouldn't include the 29%. So how would you purchase that if it wasn't in the budget when it started out?"

Mr. Hamer: "This was the purchase of the motorgrader that was in last year's budget. 09-08."

Committee Member Fish: "I thought you were talking about the 2010-2011 budget according to your notes."

Mr. Hamer: "In the bid document we have a statement that says if we would like to purchase any additional units by mutual agreement of both parties, we would be allowed to do that. So since they had been granted another motorgrader in this year's budget, we contacted Blanchard and see if they would honor their price from the previous bid. They said they would. It's identical, the same model, make and everything that we want this year."

Committee Member Fish: "I guess the question that is not directed at you is that there again the bid was awarded on March 22nd using the old one. Prior to the budget even being approved, when the first reading of the budget asks that that money not be there for the Capital Improvement Budget. That bothers me."

Supervisor Davis: "Mr. Chairman. Mr. Fish, no, the bid that we did in March was for last year's budget. So it was covered. This was not done prior to Council's approval. This was on equipment that was approved in last year's budget."

Committee Member Fish: "Then there is a typo on your notes."

Supervisor Davis: "Well, it's not my notes, but I don't think so. I think..."

Committee Member Fish: "It says right in here that it was approved in the 2010-2011 budget."

Supervisor Davis: "The new motorgrader is approved. This motorgrader that we are talking about tonight is approved in the 2010-2011 budget. There was also one in last year's so the bid that was taken was for last year's motorgrader, but Blanchard has offered that price and extended it to this year so that we can buy the same, this year's under the same bid."

Mr. Hamer: "Under the same price and same bid document."

Committee Member Callanan: "Mr. Chairman"

Chairman Call: "Mr. Callanan"

Committee Member Callanan: "I didn't quite get an answer on the model year on this."

Mr. Hamer: "It would be a 2010."

Committee Member Callanan: "That is meaningless to me because you know Blanchard has got a very loose standard as to what a model year is."

Mr. Hamer: "It would be ordered when the PO is placed and it would take probably...he said it should be delivered sometime in December."

Committee Member Callanan: "I care about when it was manufactured."

Mr. Hamer: "It would be manufactured once we place the order."

Committee Member Callanan: "Ok, so it would be manufactured this year?"

Mr. Hamer: "Yes sir."

Committee Member Callanan: "From reading this, it seems like they won based on their guaranteed response time, right? Is that fair enough to say?"

Mr. Hamer: "That was a big part of it, yes sir."

Chairman Call: "Anything else, Mr. Callanan?"

Committee Member Callanan: "Nope, that's it."

Chairman Call: "Anybody else have any comments or questions?"

Committee Member Callanan: "I move to deny."

Committee Member Fish: "Second"

Chairman Call: "Move to deny. Was that your motion? "

Committee Member Callanan: "Yes"

Chairman Call: "Ok, I have a motion to deny and a second. All in favor say Aye? (Ayes)
All opposed? (Nays) Then the motion to purchase the equipment carries."

Committee Member Callanan: "I suggest a Roll Call."

Chairman Call: "You want a Roll Call?"

Committee Member Callanan: "Yes, please"

Ms. Barbara Austin, Clerk to Council: "

Council Members voting "Nay": Farley, Callanan,

Committee Member Fish: "Wait a minute. For clarification you are going backwards."

Committee Member Callanan: "No, I'm sorry."

Committee Member Fish: "I vote to deny, right?"

Committee Member Callanan: "This is for a motion to deny so I voted Yes."

Ms. Barbara Austin, Clerk to Council:

Council Members Voting "Aye": Callanan, Cathy Davis, Fish

Council Members Voting "Nay": Farley, Schurlknight, Pinckney

Chairman Call voted Nay to break the tie.

Ms. Nicole Ewing: "The motion fails and the floor is now open for any other motion."

Committee Member Schurlknight: "I make a motion that we recommend the purchase."

Committee Member Pinckney: "Second"

Chairman Call: "Motion and a second. Who seconded? Was that Mr. Pinckney?"

Committee Member Pinckney: "Yea, I seconded."

Chairman Call: "I have a motion and a second. All in favor, say Aye? (Ayes) All opposed Nay? (Nays) Ms. Austin, would you call the roll again please?"

Ms. Barbara Austin, Clerk to Council:

Council Members Voting "Aye": Farley, Schurlknight, Pinckney

Council Members Voting "Nay": Callanan, Cathy Davis, Fish

Chairman Call: "I'll vote Aye. So the motion carries.

It was moved by Committee Member Schurlknight and seconded by Committee Member Pinckney to **approve** the purchase of **motor grader** budgeted in FY 2010-2011. The motion passed by majority voice vote of the Committee. Committee Members Callanan, Cathy Davis, Fish voted "Nay".

It was moved by Committee Member Schurlknight and seconded by Committee Member Pinckney to **adjourn** the Committee on Public Works & Purchasing meeting. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

The meeting ended at 7:04 pm.

September 13, 2010

Date Approved

PUBLIC WORKS AND PURCHASING
(Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council)

Chairman: Mr. Robert O. Call, Jr., District No. 3

Members: Mr. Phillip Farley, District No. 1
Mr. Timothy J. Callanan, District No. 2
Mrs. Cathy S. Davis, District No. 4
Mr. Dennis Fish, District No. 5
Mr. Jack H. Schurlknight, District No. 6
Mr. Caldwell Pinckney, Jr., District No. 7
Mr. Steve C. Davis, District No. 8
Mr. Daniel W. Davis, Supervisor, ex officio

A meeting of the **COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND PURCHASING**, Standing Committee of Berkeley County Council will be held on **Monday August 9, 2010**, at **6:00 p.m.**, following other scheduled committee meetings in the Assembly Room, Berkeley County Administration Building, 1003 Highway 52, Moncks Corner, South Carolina.

AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 12, 2010

July 26, 2010

A. Consideration of a Resolution setting fees for a Stormwater Service Fee to fund implementation of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.

B. Mr. Frank Carson, Berkeley County Engineer, Re: Transfer of additional funds in the amount of \$6,510.35 from contingency to the Stormwater Management Program department.

C. Ms. Angela Pinson, Director of Administration, Berkeley County Water and Sanitation, Re: Purchase and installation of Cogsdale Utility Billing Software in the amount of \$656,593.00, initial amount of \$131,319.00; balance to be paid over a four year period in the approximate amount of \$172,938 per year.

D. Mr. John F. Hamer, CPPB, Director of Procurement, Re: Purchase of motor grader budgeted in FY 2010-2011.

August 4, 2010

S/Barbara B. Austin, CCC

Clerk of County Council